Proposal to produce long-lived mesoscopic superpositions through an atom-driven field interaction

C. J. Villas-Bôas, F. R. de Paula, R. M. Serra, and M. H. Y. Moussa.

Departamento de Física, Universidade Federal de São Carlos,

PO Box 676, São Carlos, 13565-905, SP, Brazil.

arXiv:quant-ph/0210086v3 8 Jan 2004

Abstract

We present a proposal for the production of longer-lived mesoscopic superpositions which relies on two requirements: parametric amplification and squeezed vacuum reservoir for cavity-field states. Our proposal involves the interaction of a two-level atom with a cavity field which is simultaneously subjected to amplification processes.

PACS numbers: 32.80.-t, 42.50.Ct, 42.50.Dv

Journal-ref: J. Opt. B: Quantum Semiclass. Opt. **5**, 391 (2003)

The mastery of techniques for preparing cavity-field states through atom-field interaction in cavity quantum electrodynamics (QED) is crucial to many useful applications in quantum optics. As high-Q cavities have permitted the preparation of cavity-field superpositions of the form $|\Psi\rangle = \left(\left|\alpha\, e^{i\phi}\right\rangle + \left|\alpha\, e^{-i\phi}\right\rangle\right)/\sqrt{2}$, with mean number of oscillator quanta $|\alpha|^2 \approx 10$, mesoscopic quantum coherence in cavity QED has been investigated: the progressive decoherence of the superposition $|\Psi\rangle$, involving radiation fields with classically distinct phases, was observed through atom-field interaction [1] and the reversible decoherence of such a cavity-field state has been conjectured [2]. In this letter we present a proposal for the achievement of long-lived mesoscopic superposition states in cavity QED which relies on two basic requirements: parametric amplification and an engineered squeezed-vacuum reservoir for cavity-field states. Our proposal considers the dispersive interaction of a two-level atom with a cavity field which is simultaneously under amplification processes. The parametric amplification is employed to achieve the required high degrees of squeezing and excitation of what we actually want to be a mesoscopic superposition state. Such long-lived squeezed-mesoscopic state, under the action of a likewise squeezed reservoir, exhibit a decoherence time order of magnitudes longer than those for non-squeezed cavity-field states subjected to the influence of *i*) a squeezed reservoir and *ii*) a non-squeezed reservoir.

Atom-driven field interaction: The proposed configuration for engineering driven-cavity-field states, based on the scheme by Brune *et al.* [3], consists of a two-level Rydberg atom which crosses a Ramsey-type arrangement, i.e., a high-Q micromaser cavity C located between two Ramsey zones. After interacting with this arrangement, the atom is counted by ionization chambers, projecting the cavity-field state in C. The transition $|2\rangle \rightarrow |1\rangle$ of the two-level atom (excited $|2\rangle$ and ground state $|1\rangle$) is far from resonant with the cavity mode frequency, allowing for a dispersive atom-field interaction. In addition to the interaction with the two-level atom, the cavity mode is simultaneously submitted to linear and parametric amplifications so that the Hamiltonian of our model is given by ($\hbar = 1$)

$$H = \omega a^\dagger a + \frac{\omega_0}{2}\sigma_z + \chi a^\dagger a \sigma_z + \zeta(t) a^{\dagger^2} + \zeta^*(t) a^2 + \xi(t) a^\dagger + \xi^*(t) a, \qquad (1)$$

where $\sigma_z = |2\rangle\langle 2| - |1\rangle\langle 1|$, a and $a^\dagger$ are, respectively, the creation and annihilation operators for the cavity mode of frequency ω which lies between the two atomic energy levels, which are separated by ω_0, such that the detuning $\delta = |\omega - \omega_0|$ is large enough (compared to the dipole atom-field coupling Ω, i.e, $\delta \gg \Omega$) to enable only virtual transitions to occur between

the states $|1\rangle$ and $|2\rangle$. In this regime, the effective atom-field coupling parameter inside the cavity is $\chi = \Omega^2/\delta$ [4]. We suppose, for simplicity, that the atom-field coupling is turned on (off) suddenly at the instant the atom enters (leaves) the cavity region, such that $\chi = 0$ when the atom is outside the cavity. The time-dependent (TD) functions $\zeta(t)$ and $\xi(t)$ allow for the parametric and linear amplifications, respectively. We consider the atom, prepared at time t_0 by the first Ramsey zone in a $|1\rangle$,$|2\rangle$ superposition, to reach C at time t_1 and leaves it at t_2. The linear and parametric pumping are supposed to be turned on also at t_0 and turned off at a convenient time $t \geq t_2$.

The Schrödinger state vector associated with Hamiltonian (1) can be written using

$$|\Psi(t)\rangle = \mathrm{e}^{i\omega_0 t/2}|1\rangle|\Phi_1(t)\rangle + \mathrm{e}^{-i\omega_0 t/2}|2\rangle|\Phi_2(t)\rangle, \tag{2}$$

where $|\Phi_\ell(t)\rangle = \int \frac{d^2\alpha}{\pi}\mathcal{A}_\ell(\alpha,t)|\alpha\rangle$, $\ell = 1,2$, the complex quantity α standing for the eigenvalues of a, and $\mathcal{A}_\ell(\alpha,t) = \langle\alpha,\ell|\Psi(t)\rangle$ are the expansion coefficients for $|\Phi_\ell(t)\rangle$ in the basis of coherent-state, $\{|\alpha\rangle\}$. Using the orthogonality of the atomic states and Eqs. (1) and (2) we obtain the uncoupled TD Schrödinger equations:

$$i\frac{d}{dt}|\Phi_\ell(t)\rangle = \mathbf{H}_\ell|\Phi_\ell(t)\rangle, \tag{3}$$

$$\mathbf{H}_\ell = \omega_\ell(t)a^\dagger a + \zeta(t)a^{\dagger^2} + \zeta^*(t)a^2 + \xi(t)a^\dagger + \xi^*(t)a, \tag{4}$$

with $\omega_\ell(t) = \left[\omega + (-1)^\ell\chi\right]$. Note that the problem has been reduced to that of a cavity field under parametric and linear amplifications, whose frequency ω is shifted by $-\chi$ $(+\chi)$ when interacting with the atomic state $|1\rangle$ $(|2\rangle)$, during the time interval $\tau = t_2 - t_1$.

Time-dependent invariants: To solve the Schrödinger Eq. (3) we employ the time-dependent invariants of Lewis and Riesenfeld [5]. However, instead of proposing an invariant associated with the Hamiltonian (4), we first perform a unitary transformation on Eq. (3) in order to reduce it to a form which already has an associated known invariant. Thus, under a unitary transformation represented by the operator $S(\varepsilon_\ell)$ (ε_ℓ standing for a set of TD group parameters which may also depend on the atomic state ℓ), we obtain from Eq. (3)

$$i\frac{d}{dt}\left|\Phi_\ell^S(t)\right\rangle = \mathcal{H}_\ell^S\left|\Phi_\ell^S(t)\right\rangle, \tag{5}$$

where the transformed Hamiltonian and wave vector are given by

$$\mathcal{H}_\ell^S = S^\dagger(\varepsilon_\ell)\mathcal{H}_\ell S(\varepsilon_\ell) + i\frac{dS^\dagger(\varepsilon_\ell)}{dt}S(\varepsilon_\ell), \tag{6a}$$

$$\left|\Phi_\ell^S(t)\right\rangle = S^\dagger(\varepsilon_\ell)|\Phi_\ell(t)\rangle. \tag{6b}$$

In what follows we employ two theorems to obtain the solution of the TD Schrödinger Eq. (3): a) on the one hand, a theorem exposed in [6] asserts that if $I_\ell(t)$ is an invariant associated to $\mathcal{H}_\ell$ (i.e., $dI_\ell(t)/dt = \partial I_\ell/\partial t + i\left[\mathcal{H}_\ell, I_\ell(t)\right] = 0$), then the transformed operator $I_\ell^S(t) = S^\dagger(\varepsilon_\ell)I_\ell(t)S(\varepsilon_\ell)$ becomes an invariant associated to $\mathcal{H}_\ell^S$; b) on the other hand, from Lewis and Riesenfeld's well-known theorem [5], it follows that a solution of the Schrödinger equation is an eigenstate of the Hermitian invariant $I_\ell(t)$ multiplied by a TD phase factor. It follows from a) and b) that the solutions of Eq. (3) are given by $|\Phi_\ell(t)\rangle = S(\varepsilon_\ell)\left|\Phi_\ell^S(t)\right\rangle = S(\varepsilon_\ell)\exp\left[i\phi_{\ell,m}^S(t)\right]|m,t\rangle_S$ $(m = 0, 1, 2, ...)$, where $|m,t\rangle_S$ is the eigenstate of the invariant [7] and the Lewis and Riesenfeld phase [5] obeys

$$\phi_{\ell,m}^S(t) = \int_{t_i}^{t} dt'\,{}_S\langle m,t'|\left(i\,\partial/\partial t' - \mathcal{H}_\ell^S\right)|m,t'\rangle_S\,. \tag{7}$$

It is straightforward to verify that under the unitary transformation carried out by the operator $S(\varepsilon_\ell)$ the TD phase is invariant: $\phi_{\ell,m}^S(t) = \phi_{\ell,m}(t)$.

The transformed Hamiltonian: Next, we associate the unitary transformation with the squeeze operator $S(\varepsilon_\ell) = \exp\left[\frac{1}{2}\left(\varepsilon_\ell a^{\dagger 2} - \varepsilon_\ell^* a^2\right)\right]$, where the complex TD function $\varepsilon_\ell(t) = r_\ell(t)\,\mathrm{e}^{i\varphi_\ell(t)}$ includes the squeeze parameters $r_\ell(t)$ and $\varphi_\ell(t)$. ($r_\ell(t)$ is associated with a squeeze factor while $\varphi_\ell(t)$ defines the squeezing direction in phase space.) Moreover, the TD parameters for the parametric and linear amplifications are written as $\zeta(t) = \kappa(t)\,\mathrm{e}^{i\eta(t)}$ and $\xi(t) = \varkappa(t)\,\mathrm{e}^{i\varpi(t)}$, respectively. The squeeze parameters ($r_\ell(t)$, $\varphi_\ell(t)$), the amplification amplitudes ($\kappa(t)$,$\varkappa(t)$) and frequencies ($\eta(t)$,$\varpi(t)$) are real TD functions. From the above assumptions and after a lengthy calculation, the transformed Hamiltonian becomes

$$\mathcal{H}_\ell^S = \Omega_\ell(t)a^\dagger a + \Lambda_\ell(t)a^\dagger + \Lambda_\ell^*(t)a + \digamma_\ell(t), \tag{8}$$

provided that its TD coefficients satisfy

$$\Omega_\ell(t) = \omega_\ell(t) + 2\kappa(t)\tanh r_\ell(t)\cos\left(\eta(t) - \varphi_\ell(t)\right), \tag{9a}$$

$$\Lambda_\ell(t) = \xi(t)\cosh r_\ell(t) + \xi^*(t)\,\mathrm{e}^{i\varphi_\ell(t)}\sinh r_\ell(t), \tag{9b}$$

$$\digamma_\ell(t) = \kappa(t)\tanh r_\ell(t)\cos\left(\eta(t) - \varphi_\ell(t)\right), \tag{9c}$$

while the squeeze parameters $r_\ell(t)$ and $\varphi_\ell(t)$ are determined by solving the coupled differential equations

$$\dot{r}_\ell(t) = 2\kappa(t)\sin\left(\eta(t) - \varphi_\ell(t)\right), \tag{10a}$$

$$\dot{\varphi}_\ell(t) = -2\omega_\ell(t) - 4\kappa(t)\coth\left(2r_\ell(t)\right)\cos\left(\eta(t) - \varphi_\ell(t)\right). \tag{10b}$$

It is evident from these relations that the TD group parameters $\varepsilon_\ell(t)$, defining the unitary operator $S(\varepsilon_\ell)$, depends on the atomic state ℓ, as assumed from the beginning.

The evolution operators: With the Hamiltonian (8) at hand we return to the solution of the Schrödinger Eq. (5). The Invariant associated to this Hamiltonian is given by [7]

$$I_\ell^S(t) = a^\dagger a - \theta_\ell(t)a^\dagger - \theta_\ell^*(t)a + \mathfrak{f}_\ell(t), \tag{11}$$

$\theta_\ell(t)$ being a solution to the equation $i\dot{\theta}_\ell(t) = \Omega_\ell(t)\theta_\ell(t) + \Lambda_\ell(t)$ while $\dot{\mathfrak{f}}_\ell(t) = \theta_\ell^*(t)\Lambda_\ell(t) - \theta_\ell(t)\Lambda_\ell^*(t) = id\left|\theta_\ell(t)\right|^2/dt$. The application of the invariant method leads to the wave vector [7]

$$\left|\Phi_\ell^S(t)\right\rangle = \mathrm{e}^{i\phi_{\ell,m}(t)}\left|m,t\right\rangle_S = \mathrm{e}^{i\phi_{\ell,m}(t)}\,D\left[\theta_\ell(t)\right]\left|m\right\rangle \;\; (m = 0,1,2,...), \tag{12}$$

where $|m\rangle$ is the number state and $D\left[\theta_\ell(t)\right] = \exp\left[\theta_\ell(t)a^\dagger - \theta_\ell^*(t)a\right]$ is the displacement operator.

Therefore, the solutions of the Schrödinger Eq. (3), which form a complete set, read $\left|\Phi_\ell(t)\right\rangle = S\left[\varepsilon_\ell(t)\right]\left|\Phi_\ell^S(t)\right\rangle = U_\ell(t)\left|m\right\rangle$, where $U_\ell(t) = \Upsilon_\ell(t)S\left[\varepsilon_\ell(t)\right]D\left[\theta_\ell(y)\right]R\left[\Omega_\ell(t)\right]$ is a unitary operator composed, in addition to the squeeze and the displacement operators, of a global phase factor $\Upsilon_\ell(t) = \exp\left\{-\frac{i}{2}\left[\beta(t) - \omega t\right]\right\}$ and the rotation operator (coming from the TD Lewis and Riesenfeld phase factor) $R\left[\Omega_\ell(t)\right] = \exp\left[-ia^\dagger a\beta_\ell(t)\right]$, with $\beta_\ell(t) = \int_{t_i}^t \Omega_\ell(t')dt'$. Hence, for the solution of Schrödinger Eq. (3), we find $\left|\Phi_\ell(t)\right\rangle = U_\ell(t)U_\ell^\dagger(t_i)\left|\Phi_\ell(t_i)\right\rangle$,which finally defines the evolution operators $\mathbb{U}_\ell(t,t_i) = U_\ell(t)U_\ell^\dagger(t_i)$.

Evolution of the atom-field state: Let us assume that the micromaser cavity is prepared at time t_0 in a single-mode coherent state $|\alpha\rangle$ by a monochromatic source. As mentioned above, the linear and parametric pumping are supposed to be turned on also at t_0, at the time the atom is prepared by the first Ramsey zone in the superposition state $c_1\left|1\right\rangle + c_2\left|2\right\rangle$. Evidently, the evolution operators $\mathbb{U}(t_1,t_0)$ and $\mathbb{U}(t,t_2)$ governing the dynamics of the cavity-field state while the atom is outside the cavity, do not depend on the state of the two-level atom. However, the operator $\mathbb{U}_\ell(t_2,t_1)$, given the evolution of the cavity-field state during its interaction with the atom, does depend on the atomic state and differs from the

operators $\mathbb{U}(t_1,t_0)$ and $\mathbb{U}(t,t_2)$ only by the shifted frequency $\omega_\ell(t)$. With this in mind it is straightforward to verify that the measurement of the atomic state, after undergoing a $\pi/2$ pulse in the second Ramsey zone, projects the cavity field in the "Schrödinger cat"-like state [8]

$$|\Psi(t)\rangle = \mathcal{N}_\pm \left[\pm \mathrm{e}^{i\omega_0 t/2}\, c_1 \mathsf{U}_1(t,t_0) + \mathrm{e}^{-i\omega_0 t/2}\, c_2 \mathsf{U}_2(t,t_0)\right] |\alpha\rangle\,, \tag{13}$$

where the sign $+$ or $-$ occurs if the atom is detected in state $|2\rangle$ or $|1\rangle$, respectively, $\mathcal{N}_\pm$ accounts for the normalization factors, and the evolution operator reads $\mathsf{U}_\ell(t,t_0) = \mathbb{U}(t,t_2)\mathbb{U}_\ell(t_2,t_1)\mathbb{U}(t_1,t_0)$. From Eq. (13) it follows that, after measuring the atomic level used to generate the superposition state of the radiation field, it is possible to control such superposition by adjusting the TD driven parameters $\kappa(t)$, $\varkappa(t)$, $\eta(t)$, and $\varpi(t)$.

Analytical solutions of the Characteristic equations (10a,10b): Next, we investigate the situation where the cavity mode $|\alpha\rangle$ is resonant with the driven fields during the time the atom is out of the cavity: from t_0 to t_1 and t_2 to t. The parametric amplifier is assumed to operate in a degenerate mode in which the *signal* and the *idler* frequencies coincide, producing a single-mode driven field. In the resonant regime this single-mode field has the same frequency ω as the cavity mode so that $\eta(t) = -2\omega t$. For the resonant linear amplifier it follows that $\varpi(t) = \omega t$. However, during the time interval the atom is inside the cavity, from t_1 to t_2, it pulls the mode frequency out of resonance with the driven fields establishing a dispersive regime of the amplification process. In the resonant regime the solutions of the coupled differential Eqs. (10a,10b) are given by [6, 8]

$$\cosh(2r(t)) = \sqrt{1+\mathcal{C}_i^2}\cosh\left[\operatorname{arccosh}\left(\frac{\cosh(2r(t_i))}{\sqrt{1+\mathcal{C}_i^2}}\right) + u(t)\right], \tag{14a}$$

$$\cos(\varphi(t)-\eta(t)) = -\frac{\mathcal{C}_i}{\sqrt{(1+\mathcal{C}_i^2)\cosh^2(u(t)-1)}}, \tag{14b}$$

where $u(t) = 4\int \kappa(t)dt$ and the constant of motion $\mathcal{C}_i = \cos(\varphi(t)-\eta(t))\sinh(2r(t))$, depends on the initial values $r(t_i)$, $\varphi(t_i)$, and $\eta(t_i)$, where $i = 0, 2$. It is possible to show [8] that in the dispersive regime Eqs. (10a,10b) can be solved by quadrature [6], leading to a constant of motion, $\mathcal{C}_1 = \cosh(2r_\ell(t)) + \mathfrak{P}_\ell \cos(\varphi_\ell(t)-\eta(t))\sinh(2r_\ell(t))$,which now depends on the initial values $r(t_1)$, $\varphi(t_1)$, and $\eta(t_1)$. Despite the assumption that the atom-field coupling is turned on (off) suddenly, these initial values must be computed from the solutions for the resonant amplification regime at time t_1. With this procedure we obtain the solutions for the

resonant amplification $(r(t_1), \varphi(t_1))$ as a limit of those for the dispersive amplification $(r(t_1), \varphi(t_1))$ when $\chi \to 0$. The parameter $\mathfrak{P}_\ell = (-1)^\ell 2\kappa/\chi$, defined for a constant amplification amplitude κ, is an effective macroscopic coupling. Therefore, for the dispersive regime we find three different solutions depending on $|\mathfrak{P}_\ell|$: the strong ($|\mathfrak{P}| > 1$), the weak ($|\mathfrak{P}_\ell| < 1$), and the critical coupling ($|\mathfrak{P}_\ell| = 1$). Considering the weak coupling regime, the TD squeeze parameters when $\mathcal{C}_1 > \sqrt{1-\mathfrak{P}_\ell^2}$ are given by

$$\cosh\left(2r_\ell(t)\right) = \frac{\mathcal{C}_1}{1-\mathfrak{P}_\ell^2}\left\{1 - |\mathfrak{P}_\ell|\,\frac{\sqrt{\mathcal{C}_1^2-(1-\mathfrak{P}_\ell^2)}}{\mathcal{C}_1}\right.$$
$$\left.\times \sin\left[\arcsin\left(\frac{\mathcal{C}_1\,|\mathfrak{P}_\ell|}{\sqrt{\mathcal{C}_1^2-(1-\mathfrak{P}_\ell^2)}}\right) - \frac{\kappa\sqrt{1-\mathfrak{P}_\ell^2}}{|\mathfrak{P}_\ell|}(t-t_1)\right]\right\}, \tag{15a}$$

$$\cos\left(\varphi_\ell(t)-\eta(t)\right) = \pm\frac{\mathcal{C}_1-\cosh\left(2r_\ell(t)\right)}{\mathfrak{P}_\ell\,|\sinh\left(2r_\ell(t)\right)|}. \tag{15b}$$

A protocol for engineering mesoscopic cavity-field states: To prepare a particular superposition state from (13) we follow a three-step protocol. 1) First, we adjust the amplitude κ of the parametric amplification and the atom-field interaction time $\tau = t_2 - t_1$ in order to obtain a particular angle $\Theta/2 = \left(\varphi_1(t_2) - \varphi_2(t_2)\right)/2$ defined by the squeezing directions of the states composing the "Schrödinger cat"-like superposition. 2) Next, the desired excitation of the prepared state can be achieved by manipulating the excitation of the initial coherent state injected into the cavity and/or the amplitude of the linear amplification (the strength of the parametric amplification has been fixed in the first step) and/or the time interval of the amplification process. 3) Finally, the amplitude of both states composing the "Schrödinger cat"-like superposition can be adjusted through the probability amplitudes of the atomic superposition state prepared in the first Ramsey zone.

Evidently, the squeezed superposition in Eq. (13) was ideally prepared. In a real engineering process the dissipative mechanisms of both the cavity and the two-level atom, despite of the fluctuations intrinsic to their interaction, must be taken into account. The complex calculations involved in the engineering process of quantum states under the realistic quantum dissipation and fluctuation conditions can be surpassed through the phenomenological-operator approach as presented in Refs. [9, 10]. However, we will not consider in the present work the action of the reservoir in the preparation of the squeezed superposition (13), since the time interval required for this prepartion, of order of 10^{-4}-10^{-5} s, is considerably smaller than the relaxation times of both the cavity field and the two-level atom, around $\tau_R \approx 10^{-2}$

s [3, 11]. Therefore, as usual for estimating the decoherence time, we next consider that an ideally prepared state is submitted to action of a quantum reservoir. In addition, we will be interested in the action of a vacuum-squeezed reservoir at absolute zero whose density operator reads $\prod_k S_k \left|0_k\right\rangle \left\langle 0_k\right| S_k^\dagger$, S_k being the squeezed operator for the kth bath oscillator mode. We are here considering that, somehow, it is possible to completely describe all the mechanisms of dissipation of the cavity by the action of a vacuum-squeezed reservoir. Describing the reservoir by a collection of harmonic oscillators $\sum_k \hbar\omega_k b_k^\dagger b_k$ and its interaction with the cavity mode by $\sum_k \hbar(\lambda_k a^\dagger b_k + \lambda_k^* a b_k^\dagger)$, the decoherence time deduced from the idempotency defect of the reduced density operator of the cavity field, as suggested in [12], is given by

$$\tau = \frac{\tau_R}{2\left|(2N+1)\left(\langle a^\dagger\rangle\langle a\rangle - \langle a^\dagger a\rangle\right) + 2\,\mathrm{Re}\left[M\left(\langle a^\dagger\rangle^2 - \left\langle (a^\dagger)^2\right\rangle\right)\right] - N\right|}, \tag{16}$$

where τ_R is the relaxation time, $N = \sinh^2(\widetilde{r})$, and $M = -\,\mathrm{e}^{i\widetilde{\varphi}}\sinh(2\widetilde{r})/2$, $\widetilde{r}$ and $\widetilde{\varphi}$ being the squeeze parameters of the vacuum reservoir [8]. The mean values are computed from the prepared squeezed superposition (13). Since the excitation of the initial coherent state α and the squeeze parameters $(r(t_2), \varphi_\ell(t_2))$ have been fixed by the engineering protocol, we note that Eq. (16) depends only on the reservoir squeeze parameters ($\widetilde{r}$,$\widetilde{\varphi}$). Considering the situation where α is real and $\exp(-2\alpha^2) \approx 0$ (implying $\alpha \gtrapprox \sqrt{2}$), the maximization of the decoherence time τ with respect to these parameters leads to the results

$$\widetilde{r}_A = r + \ln(1+4\alpha^2)/4, \quad \widetilde{\varphi}_A = 0, \tag{17a}$$

$$\widetilde{r}_B = r - \ln(1+4\alpha^2)/4, \quad \widetilde{\varphi}_B = \pi, \tag{17b}$$

when fixing $\Theta = 2n\pi$ (n integer), i.e., the states composing the superposition (13) are squeezed in the same direction. When $\Theta \neq 2n\pi$, the maximum of τ turns out to be smaller than that for $\Theta = 2n\pi$, given either by the pair ($\widetilde{r}_A$, $\widetilde{\varphi}_A$) or ($\widetilde{r}_B$, $\widetilde{\varphi}_B$) when considering $\varphi_\ell(t_2) = (2m_\ell + 1)\pi$ or $\varphi_\ell(t_2) = 2m_\ell\pi$ (m_ℓ integer), respectively (note that $n = |m_1 - m_2|$). Observe that the direction of squeezing of both states composing the superposition (13), defined by the angle $\varphi_1(t_2)$ or $\varphi_2(t_2)$ has to be perpendicular to the direction of squeezing of the vacuum reservoir.

Next, we compute the "distance" in phase space between the centers of the quasi-probability distribution of the individual states composing the prepared superposition (13).

This distance is defined by the quadratures of the cavity field $X = (a^\dagger + a)/2$ and $Y = (a - a^\dagger)/2i$, as $D = \left[(\langle X\rangle_2 - \langle X\rangle_1)^2 + (\langle Y\rangle_2 - \langle Y\rangle_1)^2\right]^{1/2}$, the subscripts 1,2 referring to the two states composing the superposition. When considering $\varphi_1(t_2) = \varphi_2(t_2) = (2m+1)\pi$ or $2m\pi$, the distance becomes $D = \langle X\rangle_2 - \langle X\rangle_1 = 2\alpha\exp(r)$ or $2\alpha\exp(-r)$, respectively. We will focus on the case $\varphi_1(t_2) = (2m_1+1)\pi$, since it results in a large distance D between the two states composing what we actually want to be a mesoscopic superposition. Assuming the squeezing factor r so that $\exp(-2r) \approx 0$ in addition to $\exp(-2\alpha^2) \approx 0$, the decoherence time and the mean photon number of the prepared state, following from the values $(\widetilde{r}_A, \widetilde{\varphi}_A)$, reads

$$\tau \approx \tau_R/\alpha, \quad \langle n\rangle = \left\langle a^\dagger a\right\rangle \approx \alpha^2\exp(2r). \tag{18}$$

Remarkably, with the approximations $\exp(-2r)$, $\exp(-2\alpha^2) \approx 0$, the decoherence time for the prepared cavity-field state when $\varphi_1(t_2) = \varphi_2(t_2) = (2m_2+1)\pi$ — *under the action of a vacuum reservoir squeezed in the direction* $\widetilde{\varphi}_A = 0$ — turns out to be practically independent of the parameter r and thus of their own intensity $\langle n\rangle$ and distance D. From the result in Eq. (18) we conclude that it is convenient to start from a coherent state α as small as possible (within the limit $\exp(-2\alpha^2) \approx 0$) and to adjust the macroscopic coupling parameter $|\mathfrak{P}_\ell|$ in order to obtain a large squeeze factor and so a large intensity of the prepared state, since we are actually interested in mesoscopic superpositions. We stress that even considering the weak coupling regime ($|\mathfrak{P}_\ell| < 1$) we obtain, from Eqs.(14a) and (15a), large squeeze parameters. Considering $|\mathfrak{P}_\ell| = 0.1$, $\alpha = \sqrt{2}$, and the experimental running time about $2 \times 10^{-4}s$, we get a superposition state where $r \approx 2$ and $\langle n\rangle \approx 10^2$ photons.

The mechanism behind this result is the degree of entanglement between the prepared state and the modes of the reservoir, which depends on the relative direction of their squeezing, defined by the angles $\varphi_1(t_2) = \varphi_2(t_2)$ and $\widetilde{\varphi}_A$. A result supporting this argument is presented in [13] where it is shown that the injection of two modes, squeezed in perpendicular directions, in a 50/50 beam splitter does not generate an entangled state. A careful analysis of the dependence on the degree of entanglement and the relative direction of squeezing between a prepared state and its multimode reservoir — a collection of independent beam splitters — is presented in [8]. Despite the fact that the mechanism behind the long-lived mesoscopic superpositions is mainly the perpendicular directions between the squeezing of the prepared state and the reservoir modes, the magnitude of the parameter r plays a crucial role in the present scheme for producing the mesoscopic superposition by increasing both

their intensity $\langle n\rangle$ and distance D in phase space.

The values presented above for τ, $\langle n\rangle$, and D are to be compared with those when considering a non-squeezed (NS) cavity-field state ($\langle n\rangle_{NS} = \alpha^2$, $D_{NS} = 2\alpha$) under the influence of i) a squeezed reservoir, resulting in the decoherence time $\tau_i \approx \tau_R/\alpha$, and ii) a non-squeezed reservoir, such that $\tau_{ii} \approx \tau_R/2\alpha^2$. Note that in both cases i) and ii) we obtain the rates $\langle n\rangle / \langle n\rangle_{NS} \approx \exp(2r)$ and $D/D_{NS} \approx \exp(r)$. Therefore, despite the exponential increase in the rates for both excitation and distance we still get $\tau \approx \tau_i$ when comparing our results with previous schemes in the literature, where a squeezed reservoir is assumed for the enhancement of the decoherence time [14]; for non-squeezed cavity-field states and reservoir, we obtain a still better result $\tau \approx \alpha\tau_{ii}$.

It is interesting to note that we could have separated the process of Hamiltonian (1) into two successive simpler processes: first creating the superposition state (with the first three terms of Hamiltonian (1)) and then applying the parametric amplification (forth and fifth term of (1), without need of linear amplification). When considering the whole process simultaneously, as done in this work, the squeezing directions in phase space of both states composing the superposition can be adjusted independently. Evidently, this is not necessary for the proposal presented in this paper, where the components of the superposition have to be squeezed in the same direction. However, the possibility of squeezing the components of a superposition state in different directions can be considered for other applications as for state engineering in cavity QED [8]. In this connection, the linear amplification process (sixth and seventh terms of Eq. (1)) can be employed to achieve a higher excitation of the engineered state. Moreover, when considering the whole process simultaneously, we decrease the time interval of the experiment, minimizing the noise effects coming from field and atomic decays, thus achieving a higher fidelity for the generated squeezed superposition state. Even that we have not computed the noise effects during the preparation of the squeezed superposition state, it is always desirable to minimize the time interval of the engineering process in order to maximize the fidelity of the prepared state.

The experimental implementation of the proposed scheme rely on the possibility of engineering a squeezed reservoir as well as of parametrically driving cavity-field radiation. We stress that a scheme to realize physically a squeezed bath for cavity modes, via quantum-nondemolition-mediated feedback, was already presented in Ref. [18]. However, the feedback process in [18] does not eliminate the standard nonsqueezed bath and, as we have stressed,

our scheme requires a resulting optimal squeezed-vacuum reservoir. The subject of quantum reservoir engineering has attracted attention specially in the domain of trapped ions [15, 16] and, specifically, a scheme has been presented for engineering squeezed-bath-type interaction for protecting a two-level system against decoherence [17].

Regarding parametric amplification of cavity fields, a technique was recently suggested based on pulsed excitation of semiconductor layers (on the cavity walls) by laser radiation [19]. Moreover, a proposal to implement the parametric amplification of an arbitrary radiation-field state previously prepared in a high-Q cavity is presented in Ref. [20]. In this work, the nonlinear process is accomplished through the dispersive interactions of a three-level atom simultaneously with a classical driven field and a previously prepared cavity mode whose state is supposed to be squeezed. It is worth mention that all the treatment developed above in the context of cavity quantum electrodynamics, for delaying the decoherence process of a squeezed superposition by coupling it to a vacuum-squeezed reservoir, can also be implemented in ion traps. We finally mention that the proposal here presented might provide a motivation for future theoretical and experimental investigations.

Acknowledgments

We wish to express thanks for the support from FAPESP (under contracts #99/11617-0, #00/15084-5, and #02/02633-6) and CNPq (Instituto do Milênio de Informação Quântica), Brazilian agencies. We also thank S. S. Mizrahi, R. Napolitano, V. V. Dodonov, and B. Baseia for helpful discussions.

---

[1] M. Brune, E. Hagley, J. Dreyer, X. Maitre, A. Maali, C. Wunderlich, J. M. Raimond, and S. Haroche, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 4887 (1996).

[2] J. M. Raimond, M. Brune, S. Haroche, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 1964 (1997).

[3] M. Brune, S. Haroche, J. M. Raimond, L. Davidovich, and N. Zagury, Phys. Rev. A **45**, 5193 (1992).

[4] M. O. Scully and S. Zubairy, *Quantum Optics* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 1997).

[5] H. R. Lewis and W. B. Riesenfeld, J. Math. Phys. **10**, 1458 (1969).

[6] S. S. Mizrahi, M. H. Y. Moussa, and B. Baseia, Int. J. Mod. Phys. B **8**, 1563 (1994).

[7] R. R. Puri and S. V. Lawande, Phys. Lett A **70**, 69 (1979).

[8] C. J. Villas-Bôas, F. R. de Paula, R. M. Serra, and M. H. Y. Moussa, to be published elsewhere.

[9] N. G. de Almeida, P. B. Ramos, R. M. Serra, and M. H. Y. Moussa, J. Opt. B: Quantum Semiclass. Opt. **2**, 792 (2000).

[10] R. M. Serra, P. B. Ramos, N. G. de Almeida, W. D. José, and M. H. Y. Moussa, Phys. Rev. A **63**, 053813 (2001).

[11] B. T. H. Varcoe, S. Brattke, M. Weidinger, H. Walther, Nature **403**, 743 (2000).

[12] Ji Il Kim, M. C. Nemes, A. F. R. de Toledo Piza, H. E. Borges, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 207 (1996).

[13] M. S. Kim, W. Son, V. Buzek, and P. L. Knight, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 032323 (2002).

[14] M. S. Kim and V. Buzek, Phys. Rev. A **47**, 610 (1993).

[15] F. Poyatos, J. I. Cirac, and P. Zoller, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 4728 (1996)

[16] A. R. R. Carvalho, P. Milman, R. L. de Matos Filho, and L. Davidovich, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 4988 (2001).

[17] N. Lutkenhaus, J. I. Cirac, and P. Zoller, Phys. Rev. A **57**, 548 (1998).

[18] P. Tombesi and D. Vitali, Phys. Rev. A **50**, 4253 (1994).

[19] G. Carugno (private communication).

[20] C. J. Villas-Bôas, N. G. de Almeida, R. M. Serra, and M. H. Y. Moussa, quant-ph/0303119.